

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 33, 35-50, 52-59, and 61-81 are pending in this application, with claims 33 and 44 being the only independent claims. Claims 33, 35-38, 43-44, 52-54, 61-63, and 78-79 are amended. Claims 1-32 were previously canceled. Claims 34, 51, and 60 are canceled by the present communication without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as herein amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Telephonic Interview

A telephonic interview was conducted on January 15, 2010 between Examiner Jill Culler and Applicant's undersigned representative. Applicant would like to express that the Examiner's time and consideration are greatly appreciated. During the telephonic interview, the limitations of claim 51 were discussed. The contents of the discussion are included in the argument presented below.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 38 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

With respect to claim 38, independent claim 33 is amended to remove the phrase "sheet-fed". Accordingly, claim 38 no longer conflicts with the limitations of independent claim 33.

Claim 43 is amended to remove the term "twin-roll capacity" objected to by the Examiner without prejudice or disclaimer.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the rejection of claims 38 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. §112 is now deemed to be overcome.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103

Claims 44-47, 57-59, 64-65, and 81 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,147,662 (Grabau).

Claims 33-41, 48-50, 55-56, and 80 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Grabau in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,772,709 (Shibata).

Claims 42-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Grabau and Shibata, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,050,189 (Junghans).

Claims 51-54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Grabau and Shibata, and further in view of U.S. Patent no. 3,392,702 (Warner).

Claims 60-63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Grabau in view of Warner.

Claims 66-71 and 78 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Grabau and Shibata, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,246,327 (Eberhardt).

Claims 72-77 and 79 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Grabau in view of Eberhardt.

Independent claim 33 is amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 34 and 51 and now recites "precoating, prevarnishing, or preprinting the substrate with varnish or a pre-inking medium to reduce absorbent properties of the substrate to prevent or reduce absorption of the conductive paste or conductive ink by the substrate, thereby preventing or reducing a change in the inductance of the at least one of the antenna

and the oscillating circuit.” Support for this limitation is found, for example, at paragraph [0018], lines 1-3 and 7-9, of the published version of the present application (US 2008/0213019 A1).

Claim 51 was rejected by a combination of Grabau, Shibata, and Warner. The Examiner has acknowledged in the office action that Grabau and Shibata fail to teach or suggest the above-recited limitations. Warner discloses a method of coating a printing paper to form a web having a surface characterized by smoothness, levelness, uniformity of coating and freedom from holes, skips, and the like (see col. 1, lines 28-42, of Warner). However, Warner does not teach or suggest a precoating for preventing absorption of conductive paste or conductive ink by the substrate to prevent or reduce a change in inductance caused by the absorption.

Accordingly, the combination of Grabau, Shibata, and Warner fails to teach or suggest “precoating, prevarnishing, or preprinting the substrate with varnish or a pre-inking medium to reduce absorbent properties of the substrate to prevent or reduce absorption of the conductive paste or conductive ink by the substrate, thereby preventing or reducing a change in the inductance of the at least one of the antenna and the oscillating circuit”, as now expressly recited in independent claim 33. Therefore, independent claim 33 should now be allowable.

Independent claim 44 is amended to include similar limitations and should be allowable for the same reasons as is independent claim 33.

The dependent claims 35-43, 45-50, 52-59, and 61-81 are allowable for the same reasons as are independent claims 33 and 44, as well as for the additional recitations contained therein.

The application is now deemed to be in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is solicited.

Should the Examiner have any comments, questions, suggestions, or objections, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned in order to resolve any outstanding issues.

It is believed that no additional fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the present application. However, if any additional fees or charges are required at this time, they may be charged to our Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 03-2412.

Respectfully submitted,
COHEN PONTANI LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP

By /Alfred W. Froebrich/
Alfred W. Froebrich
Reg. No. 38,887
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: February 4, 2010